



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,229	08/03/2006	Weiping Zeng	1691-0222PUS1	5417

2292 7590 11/04/2008  
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

YOON, TAE H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/04/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com



Art Unit: 1796

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chappelow et al (US 6,610,759).

Rejection is maintained for reason of record with following response.

Chappelow et al teach all of the claimed components and amounts encompassing the instant amount. Thus, the instant composition would be a *prima facie* obviousness. Contrary to applicant's assertion, one objective of Chappelow et al is to obtain high bond strength as seen in various tables. For example, Chappelow et al teach use of CQ and EDMAB (the instant C) as an initiator system with MAEM in example 9, and thus applicant's assertion that Chappelow et al failed to teach an importance of EDMAB. As a matter of fact, many examples such as examples 13 and 14 in table II use HEMA (the instant B) with EDMAB and said initiator system of CQ and EDMAB (see footnote). Thus, crosslinking bifunctional monomers taught at cols. 17-18 in said examples 13 and 14 in order to improve crosslinking and mechanical properties thereof would be a *prima facie* obviousness.

Applicant points to Table 1 for unexpected results, but comparison must be based on the closest prior art, not on applicant's own choice. Chappelow et al teach the instant 2-(methacryloyloxy)ethyl maleate (in another word ,2-(methacryloyloxy)ethyl

maleic acid, MAEM), and none of examples in said Table 1 uses MAEM. Thus, said Table 1 fail to rebut obviousness.

Said Table 1 shows superior long-term bonding property of the claimed composition comprising a phthalic acid containing monomer A and amounts of components. Thus, a rejection based on JP 5-170618 is withdrawn.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H. Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 1796

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tae H Yoon /Tae H Yoon/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1796

THY/October 28, 2008